

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,539	04/02/2004	Gary L. Bush	GLB002	2517
Jack V. Musgr	7590 11/27/2007		EXAM	INER
2911 Briona W	ood Lane		COCKS, JOSIAH C	
Cedar Park, T	C /8613		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		H	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	·
, ,	10/817,539	BUSH, GARY L.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Josiah Cocks	3749	
The MAILING DATE of this communication			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communica BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on pa	apers filed through Septemb	er 14, 2007.	
	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		ters, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-10,12-14,23-37,39-41,50-54 and</u>	d 56-62 is/are nending in the	application	
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>23-26 and 50-54</u> i 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-37,39-41,54 and 56-62</u> is/are a	s/are withdrawn from consid	• •	
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) $\boxtimes$ Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12-14</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority docum</li> </ol>	ents have been received.	·	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		· · · ———	•
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bur			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	received.	
			-
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of	Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	·	

Art Unit: 3749

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination ("RCE") under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's RCE submission filed on July 2, 007 and the supplemental compliant amendment filed on September 14, 2007 have been entered.

# Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 10 refers generically to "sensed operating parameters" but is clearly intended to refer back to the operating parameters that were previously "sensed" (i.e. in line 8). The recitation in line 10 should be amended to recite "the sensed operating parameters". Appropriate correction is required.

### Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 27, and 54 to recite to include one of, the step of "iteratively sensing" (claim 1), at least one

sensor which "iteratively senses" (claim 27), and one or more inputs for "iteratively" receiving sensory data. However, the use of the term "iteratively" in these contexts does not appear in the specification as originally filed.

There examiner notes that it has been held that "[w]hile there is no in haec verba requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit or inherent disclosure. See MPEP § 2163 (citing *In re Oda*, 443 F.2d 1200, 170 USPQ 268 (CCPA 1971)). In this case, the examiner considers that at least the discussion appearing on pages 12-14 as to the incremental adjusting of the frequency in response to current sensory data as compares with previous data is considered to implicitly support the "iteratively" sensing or receiving now recited in claims 1, 27, and 54. The examiner therefore concurs with applicant's assertion on p. 18 of the July 2, 2007 response that "[t]he iterative check of the feedback parameters is described at page 12 lines 19-26." However, applicant must amend the specification to include proper antecedent basis for the recitations in claims 1, 27, and 54.

#### Election/Restrictions

4. Currently pending claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14, 27-29, 31-37, 39-41, 54, and 56-62 are allowable. The restriction requirement set forth in the Office action mailed on April 27, 2006, has been reconsidered in view of the allowability of claims to the elected invention pursuant to MPEP § 821.04(a). The restriction requirement is hereby withdrawn as to any claim that requires all the limitations of an allowable claim. Accordingly, claims 4 and 30 are hereby rejoined as requiring all the limitations of one of allowable claims 1 or 27.

In view of the withdrawal of the restriction requirement as set forth above, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Once the restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 1-10, 12-14, 27-37, 39-41, 54, and 56-62 contain allowable subject matter.
- The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Applicant's amendments and arguments submitted July 2, 2007 and September 14, 2007 have been carefully considered and are found persuasive as to the distinction of applicant's invention as now claimed over prior art previously relied upon, namely the U.S. Patents to Johnson, Kita, and Monette.

Accordingly, in light of the record taken as a whole, the prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention recited in applicant's claims 1-10, 12-14, 27-37, 39-41, 54, and 56-62.

#### Conclusion

- 7. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:
  - Correction of the above noted objection to claim 1.
  - Correction to the specification to provide proper antecedent basis for claim terminology.
  - Cancellation or other appropriate action for non-elected claims 23-26 and 50-53 (see 37 CFR 1.144).

The prosecution of this case is closed except for consideration of the above matter.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte

Quayle, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire TWO

MONTHS from the mailing date of this letter.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Josiah Cocks whose telephone number is (571) 272-4874. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven McAllister, can be reached (571) 272-6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number:

10/817,539

Art Unit: 3749

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jcc

November 20, 2007

JOSIAH COCKS

PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3749

Page 6